

- 4 - Soviet Bloc nationals to Guinea: suggest "considerable number" rather than "over 100," because evidence is not firm enough for latter and might boomerang in Soviet propaganda (Africa Desk)
- P. 8 - question whether Soviet aid program is "not" large by US standards: Of the 1.8 billions spent to date by Soviet, all of 1 billion was spent in one year - 1958; last part of para. is erroneous that "net annual drain ... never ... more than half a billion dollars" (Dillon's office)
- P. 9 - Nepal is not in category "2" (more Soviet aid than US aid); US aid to date is \$27 million, Sov Bloc is \$19.6 (South Asia Desk)
- P. 9 - question of interpretation raised, whether economic factor ("capital starved") is really "basic" to "all" explanations re underdeveloped countries; seems to underemphasize what Far East Desk called "political motivations for a neutralist pose"
- P. 10 - Sov Bloc has committed more mistakes than usually credited; suggest saying Soviet "... has blundered ..." but relatively few "major" mistakes. (Dillon's office; Kretzmann said that Atlantic magazine is carrying a major story in August on Soviet foreign-aid blunders, by David Cohn, which was originally to be titled, facetiously, "Soviet Economic Aid People Are Only Nine Feet Tall."
- P. 10 - Assertion that Bloc aid is "integrated and ... continuing basis" is not unique to Soviet; (Dillon's office) so also is US aid to an extent.
- P. 11 - likewise, US aid is not "largely on a grant basis," says Dillon's office; see US emphasis on "Development Loan Fund," which is entirely omitted from this paper. (Dillon has made two speeches recently which allude to this - attached.)
- P. 11 - bottom: suggest deletion of phrase that Sov aid is "largely for industrial development;" question next sentence, that Soviet projects are "rarely, or never" for public projects --e.g., see some of Soviet "show case" projects; also, Soviet has built some hospitals, etc., says Dillon's office.
- P. 13 - Dillon's office questioned passage referring to Sov front orgn in India, but South Asia office did not object.
- P. 15 - transmitter in Guinea; no objection to mentioning it, but Africa Desk suggested that there is no firm evidence that transmitter has actually been accepted and/or delivered. Statement as worded might boomerang in Sov propaganda.
- P. 15 - transmitter offered to Mali Federation--Africa Desk suggested reconsidering this reference, since only source known to them is classified
- P. 16 - Soviet "seek to" (add) buy chem equipment--they are not always successful, says Dillon's office
- P. 17 - Dillon's office said this assertion was probably true in balance, yet somewhat debatable; that Soviets "have nothing to gain by disorganizing markets and driving prices down in this area (Western markets)"